



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/730,886

12/10/2003

Gen Suzuki

032150

5197

38834

7590

06/28/2006

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

ROY, SIKHA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/730,886	SUZUKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sikha Roy	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The Response, filed on April 5, 2006 has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Acknowledgement is made of the receipt of English translation of priority of Japanese Patent Application 2002-368045 filed December 19, 2002.

The new drawings of Figs. 1 and 2 have been entered and are approved by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

Claims 7,8 and 10-14 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 7 and 8 which depend on claims 4 and 5 respectively 'the conductor' in line 1 should be 'a conductor' as there is no mention of any conductor in the claims 4 and 5.

Claims 10-14 depending on claims 4-8 respectively 'the circuit structure body' in line 2 should be 'a circuit structure body' as there is no mention of any circuit structure in claims 4-8.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2879

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 -8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,160,346 to Vleggaar et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 6, 107,735 to Hora.

Regarding claim 1 Vleggaar discloses (Fig. 1 column 6 lines 40-58) an organic EL display device including an airtight and waterproof container (housing) of low-melting metal for sealing an organic EL structure 2 having organic luminescence function layer 4 formed between a pair of electrodes 3 and 5 formed on a substrate.

Claim 1 differs from Vleggaar in that Vleggaar does not exemplify the airtight container provided with a potential.

Hora in pertinent field of EL display discloses (Fig. 9 column 2 lines 44-61, column 9 lines 31-60) an EL device 60 provided with transparent auxiliary electrode 1b, a third lead electrode 70 made of metallic foil is connected to this transparent auxiliary electrode 1b, thus connected to housing (the outer surface) of the lamp and is provided with a potential (grounded). Hora further teaches that this configuration of connection of the housing to a potential outside provides noise prevention and electromagnetic shielding and thus reliable operation of the EL device.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the conducting container of the organic display device of Vleggaar provided with a potential (ground potential) as taught by Hora for reducing noise and providing electromagnetic noise shielding during operation of the device.

Regarding claim 2 Vleggaar discloses the airtight container is made of conductive material (low-melting point metal).

Regarding claim 3 Vleggaar discloses (Fig.2 Embodiment 2 column 8 lines 25-36) the airtight container is constituted by a non conductive material 32 and one layer 28 of conductive layer.

Regarding claim 4 Vleggaar discloses (Fig. 4 Embodiment 3 column 8 line 64 through column 9 line 9) the airtight container has an insulating layer 51 formed on the surface of the container 48.

Regarding claim 5 Vleggaar in view of Lin discloses the potential applied to the container includes a reference potential point (ground potential).

Regarding claim 6 Hora discloses (Fig. 9) a conductor 70 connected with the container (housing) disposed in one place to apply a potential to the container. The reason for combining the arts as in claim 1 applies.

Claims 7 and 8 essentially recite the same limitation as of claim 6 and hence are rejected for the same reason.

Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,160,346 to Vleggaar et al., and U.S. Patent 6, 107,735 to Hora and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (referred as AAPA)

Regarding claim 9 Vleggaar and Hora are silent about a circuit structure body for driving the organic EL display mounted on the same substrate and the potential applied to the airtight container being one used in the circuit structure.

AAPA discloses (Fig. 2 page 5 paragraph 3 through page 6 end of last paragraph) the EL structure body and a driving IC circuit are mounted on a transparent substrate, the driving circuit electrically driving the EL structure. AAPA discloses in Fig. 2 the circuit structure is substantially constructed in such a way that the controller circuit is connected to ground potential. AAPA teaches this configuration with driving circuit and EL structure formed on same substrate reduces the number of wiring connections between the transparent substrate and external circuit.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the EL structure of Vleggaar and Hora having the same substrate with organic EL display and container connected to the ground containing the driving circuit as suggested by AAPA for reducing the number of wiring connections between the transparent substrate and external circuit.

Claims 10-14 essentially recite the same limitations as of claim 9 and hence are rejected for the same reason (see rejection of claim 9).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent 6,873,035 to Watanabe et al. and U.S. Patent 5,679,975 to Wyland et al. disclose conductive encapsulating shield on the surface of

Art Unit: 2879

an integrated package connected to ground potential for reducing inductance of the leads and noise associated with current changes.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sikha Roy

Sikha Roy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879